

Fracking has been used for 100 years, hydro-fracking for 60 years. The safety is documented with zero confirmed cases of groundwater contamination in 1 million applications over that 60 years. The director of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's Bureau of Oil and Gas Management said that he has never seen an impact to fresh groundwater directly from fracking.

Another piece of incorrect information is that no one knows what goes into fracking fluid. Well, first of all, more than 99.5 percent of the fluid is sand and water. For the remainder, Pennsylvania law requires companies to disclose all chemicals used in the fracking process, just not the specific formula. A complete list of those chemicals is available on the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Web site. They include materials that help deliver the water down the well bore and position the sand in the tiny fractures created in the formation.

□ 1940

One of the more prominent substances is guar gum, most commonly used as an emulsifier in ice cream.

You know, there are contentions that fracking is not well regulated. To the contrary, eight Federal and 11 Pennsylvania acts or laws regulate the impacts of drilling. The film "Gasland" goes so far as to assert that "the 2005 energy bill pushed through Congress by Dick Cheney exempts the oil and natural gas industries from the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Super Fund law, and about a dozen other environmental and Democratic regulations."

Well, that is patently false. It must comply with all of these laws with the caveat that the hydraulic fracturing process was never regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act in its 60-year history, and that particular energy bill was supported by 74 "yes" votes in the Senate, including those at the time of Senators Obama and Salazar.

Most alarmingly, "Gasland" has a stunning scene of a man who is turning on a tap, sticking a lighter under it and watching it ignite. "Gasland" blames natural gas development for the flaming faucet, but the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission wrote: "Dissolved methane in well water appears to be biogenic." Madam Speaker, that means naturally occurring in origin. "There are no indications of oil- and gas-related impacts to well water."

Though perhaps the most telling repudiation of this film comes from John Hanger, Secretary John Hanger of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, who for 10 years was president and CEO of the environmental organization called Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future. He appears briefly in the film. John Hanger said the film was "fundamentally dishonest" and "a deliberately false pres-

entation for dramatic effect." He called the producer a "propagandist."

Now, I am 100 percent behind producing natural gas in a safe and environmentally sound way. If there are violations of the rules or laws, either State or Federal, we rely on the good offices of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to do whatever is necessary to bring enforcement to the situation. They have proven to be capable and aggressive.

Gas drilling creates jobs and economic growth and contributes to our energy security in this country. It needs to be done right with environmental protection. It doesn't deserve a propaganda film which doesn't educate but which serves to simply demonize an industry for personal gain and political reasons.

KARZAI'S LIP SERVICE ON CORRUPTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I think we have seen this movie before.

Last week, President Hamid Karzai of Afghanistan, before an audience of international leaders on whose support he depends, pledged to root out corruption, implement reforms and run a better government, but we heard the same promises at an earlier conference this January and we heard them again when President Karzai came to Washington for a state visit in May. There seems to be little accountability when he fails to keep his word, as he never comes away from any of these gatherings with more than a slap on the wrist, if that.

If Mr. Karzai is serious about cracking down, why doesn't he start by reining in his own brother, a strongman who rules Kandahar with iron-fisted intimidation? What does President Karzai have to say about the fact that billions of dollars in cash have been flown out of Kabul Airport in the last few years?

Lip service and vague promises are really not enough, Madam Speaker. What is sustaining the Taliban more than anything else is the Afghanistan Government's failure to have any competency or legitimacy. No one is more frustrated than the Afghan people, who voiced their displeasure with government corruption in a recent survey conducted by an Afghan watchdog group.

Bribery shakedowns are increasingly seen as a way of life. The cost of securing basic services from the government depends on paying somebody off. Even when the government isn't dishonest, it is slow and ineffective. Embarrassingly, in the provinces where they have established a foothold, the Taliban runs a tighter ship than does the Afghan Government, doing a competent job of making the trains run on time.

This cannot go on, Madam Speaker. Our continued support for a feckless re-

gime is eroding our national credibility. The American people, who are fighting off a recession and who are badly in need of the money right here at home, resent sending that money to Afghanistan. They can't be expected to keep on doing this. They can't be expected to keep giving their bravest young people and their hard-earned tax dollars to prop up leaders who have no ability to govern responsibly.

Yet, even as skepticism about the war in Afghanistan grows here in our country, our leaders could be going in the opposite direction. There is legitimate concern that they might be going wobbly on the commitment to start the military redeployment out of Afghanistan 1 year from now.

At the conference in Kabul, Secretary of State Clinton said that the July 2011 date represented the start of a new phase, not the end of our involvement. She added that the United States has "no intention of abandoning our long-term mission of achieving a stable, secure, peaceful Afghanistan."

Well, Madam Speaker, if the Secretary means that we would achieve that mission with civilian resources—a Smart Security strategy which is focused on development projects, on humanitarian aid and on more support for anti-corruption efforts—then count me in, but if she means that our military commitment and occupation to Afghanistan will extend well beyond next summer, I think the American people will have something to say about that. In fact, they are saying it now. They are saying it loud and clear.

We have sacrificed enough for a failed war. It is time to bring our troops home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)